


No. 157 NOVEMBER 1981

Spearhead

35p



BRITAIN AND WEIMAR

How close the parallel?

(PAGE 6)

Nationalist comment
**WHAT
 WE
 THINK**
 on the month's news

The silly season

With the party conference season now over, what can we say in the small space available here that has not been amplified many times over in the long daily press reports that have followed each stage of the proceedings? Rather than vie inadequately with the daily press in the art of detailed analysis, may we just confine ourselves to a very broad summary, which boils down to this:-

From not one of the four major party conferences did we hear of any serious discussion of the really major issues of national survival in the 1980s, nor did we see the faintest glimmerings of the calibre of national leadership necessary to save Britain from national eclipse. We witnessed only the sickeningly familiar spectacle of very small politicians engaging in an excitable debate over the trivia of their profession, the dominating question in which

was what precise formulae best suited their parties' electoral prospects in the run up to 1984.

Some were more frank than others in making this evident. At the Tory conference at Blackpool the main stand of the 'Wets' against Mrs. Thatcher's policies was clearly that of their effect on the party's popularity with the electorate. This should not, however, be taken to mean that their leader was, as she claimed, doing what was best for the country regardless of popularity considerations; all it means is that Mrs. Thatcher is adopting the well worn device of giving the people all their nasty medicine in the earlier part of her

period of government so as to be able to administer the goodies and the candies just before election time — suitably explained, of course, by the statement that the castor oil of the first two or three years had done its job in getting the nation on a sound footing and now the sweeter treatment could be applied.

One always feels that Mr. Michael Heseltine best epitomises the mood and style of a Conservative conference — a sort of live incarnation of the character in the Peter Sellers record who waffles emptily in the familiar whine of a chinless wonder and who epitomises the soggy and foggy 'middle of the road'. None put it better than Edward Pearce in the Sunday Telegraph when he said:-

"Heseltine compassionate is a terrible sight. It was a speech of shimmering meretriciousness, a compassionate plea for the leadership. The miseries of Liverpool, however much self-induced, make up a sad subject for a politician to be making his way with. Though it reduced Junior Dimbleby to the voice father would have used for St. George's, Windsor."

Perhaps the gem from Heseltine which induced this description also best illustrated the spirit of the conference and of his party. Speaking of the Black communities in the inner cities, he said to cheers:-

"Let this party's position be absolutely clear. They are British. They live here. **They vote here.**"

The emphasis on the last words is our own, but few will argue with us that those words encapsulate the main point!

No, the party conferences, long regarded by the party politicians as the show-pieces by which they could demonstrate



STAR TURN AT BLACKPOOL
 Thatcher takes undeserved cheers at end of conference

SPEARHEAD

No. 157 NOVEMBER 1981
 Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex
 Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

their overflowing goodness to the public, have indeed become one gigantic demonstration of the fatuity and futility of the British political system, for life can offer no greater contrast than between what is heard and seen inside the conference halls, with much elegance of phrase and so many expressions of good intent, and the manifest deterioration of the nation outside — a testimony, not to years, but to decades of misgovernment. One wonders what kind of world these conference delegates live in, whether in fact they represent the same species of life as ordinary folk like you and us, or whether they are some kinds of creatures from outer space who annually descend upon British holiday resorts to discuss, not the business of this country and the dangerous world in which it has to live, but the affairs of remote planets in the galaxy, where the rules of survival are totally different. The 1981 season seemed only to confirm this thought. What will 1982 be like? Even more remote? Even sillier? Probably so.

Economic madness

Of all the silliness referred to above, we must just make mention of the biggest example of the moment. This is the conflict within the Tory Party between the supporters of Mrs. Thatcher who wish to cling to the policy of strict monetary controls and those who seek to relax those controls in the face of mounting unemployment and accelerating industrial collapse.

The silliness lies in the fact that both attitudes are based on a total ignorance of the real facts of economic life. The Thatcherite view is that controls must be kept up because the only alternative is yet more borrowing. Reflation of the economy can only be purchased at the price of a restoration of the spiral of debt incurred by previous governments, with the resulting inflation that was rampant under them.

But this in fact is not the only alternative; there is another. That is the simple creation of new money by the Government by the practice of issuing it debt-free. If this money releases vast forces of production whereby equally vast increases in the total of national wealth occur, then no inflation need in fact result. The inflation will only come as a result of the factor of interest that will be owing if the money is created in the form of loans from the banks, for the liability to pay that interest will be incorporated into the price of every item of goods and services for sale resulting from the monetary growth created.

This latter method of reflating the economy is of course the one that the 'Wets' in the Government want to see adopted, and it is the reason why, if it

were adopted, the Thatcherite theories as to what would result would indeed be proved correct.

It is only when we rid ourselves of the flat-earth superstition that all monetary growth must occur in the form of loans at interest from the banking sector that we can appreciate the nonsense, both of the Thatcher treatment of monetary stringency and of the 'Wet' prescription of reflation through new borrowing. The fact is that either way the nation loses. It did not of course occur to anyone to point this out at Blackpool, or at the Labour conference at Brighton, or at the Liberal hen party at Llandudno, or at the three-piece Social Democrat jamboree at Perth, Bradford and London. In the party game such basic truths are not known — or, if they are known, it is more than a politician's career is worth to give voice to them.

Waste of time

While the conferences of the leading British political parties were taking place at various points around our Kingdom, an equally absurd conference was being held in Melbourne, Australia, where there congregated the political heads of that increasingly daft institution, the 'Commonwealth'.

Daft, not because the Commonwealth contains nothing out of which, if it were suitably reformed, some value to Britain might come, but only because no desire to reform it seems to be apparent among those who represent its ruling circles and we must therefore take it, not as it might be, but as it is: a fraudulent contract in which the advanced White members assume all the contractual obligations and the backward Coloured members all the contractual rights. Commonwealth conferences become just a platform for those assuming the rights to shout for yet more rights and those assuming the obligations to stand in the dock in defensive posture, making the plea that they are doing as much for their Coloured dependants as can reasonably be expected at the moment and promising to do more in the future.

This was largely the format at Melbourne but the meeting was supplied an additional dimension by the introduction of the issue of sporting contacts with South Africa and the accusation made against the White members — and particularly New Zealand — that they were not abiding by the preposterous Gleneagles Agreement whereby those contacts were to be discouraged by all means available to member governments.

New Zealand Premier Robert Muldoon was in particular trouble because his country recently played host to a South African rugby team. His defence was that

his Government had attempted to induce the NZ Rugby Union to cancel the tour, had failed in this endeavour and could not impose its will by any form of compulsion — a rather feeble stance considering that what he should have said was that the Gleneagles Agreement was a load of rubbish anyway and should long ago have been cast into the dustbin. Mr. Muldoon, however, is a politician and politicians just cannot say these things, least of all at a conference of the Commonwealth!

Instead Mr. Muldoon, no doubt with an eye to an impending election at home, went onto the attack and castigated some of the Coloured countries represented at the conference for the fact that they were themselves not exactly paragons in the way of respecting human rights — a true enough observation but hardly central to the issue.

This seems to have been the be-all and end-all of this year's Commonwealth conference, and in the light of it we can see the point of the Australian newspaper which asked whether the expense to the Australian taxpayer was really justified.

Rather than terminate the Commonwealth, we believe that it should be reformed into an institution for the maintenance of Anglo-Saxon unity and the protection of Anglo-Saxon interests — with such a reform preferably incorporating a change of name, since the old name has come to symbolise so much that is ridiculous in 20th Century political jargon. If this were to occur, we could see conferences between its members having a definite purpose; as it is, they have none whatsoever.

Still sick

According to a report that appeared recently in The New York Times, car workers in a Ford plant in Britain are producing just over half the cars produced by their fellow Ford workers in a plant in West Germany.

In the German plant at Saarlouis 7,762 workers turn out 1,200 cars a day; in the British plant at Halewood, near Liverpool, 10,040 workers turn out 800 cars a day.

And the equipment in the two plants is identical.

At Saarlouis strikes are unknown; at Halewood there have been 20 this year already.

It is a matter of interest that millions of electors returned a Tory Government to power in May 1979 because they thought the Tories were going to do something about this appalling state of affairs. In fact after 2½ years in government they have done precisely nothing.

British industry, despite all the promises, is still the sick man of Europe.

A FORWARD LOOK AT BRITAIN'S POLICE

by
**EDDY
MORRISON**

THE RECENT widespread race riots have resulted in a positive deluge of reports, recommendations and questions about the role of the police in contemporary Britain, but, predictably, all this debate is confined within the framework of orthodox 'liberal' attitudes to law enforcement and of comfortable conceptions of policing rooted in bygone times when modern techniques of revolution were almost unknown in this country.

It is time to correct the balance and analyse how police would be organised and deployed in a society of the future as envisaged by nationalists, and in such an analysis I maintain that we must proceed from the basic nationalist premise that the highest moral law is the nation's will to self-preservation.

Let me make it clear at the outset that anything proposed here is seen within the context of a nationalist state and government to which the police forces are subordinate, and could in no way be acceptable at the present time, when the police hierarchy must be seen for what it is: as the instrument of a treasonable regime dedicated, not to national self-preservation, but indeed to national self-destruction.

The political left is at least right in its view that the present organisation and deployment of the police are outmoded and must be changed; it is totally wrong in its idea of how that should be done. Let me outline a few features of the changes that ought to take place in the police forces of a nationalist Britain.

- Firstly, all individuals in the police, of whatever rank, who have consistently used their powers to victimise nationalists or to favour or especially protect anti-national elements within our society, should be excluded from membership of our new police forces.
- Police should be given political education from a nationalist viewpoint as an integral part of their basic training. We must do away with the pretence that any great national institution is above involvement in the life-and-death struggle for the preservation of our nation and race. Police must be imbued with the principle that law-enforcement is not an end in itself but only a means to the protection of the national interest.
- We should do away with the federated organisation of our police forces and have them unified and centralised in a much simplified structure.



RIOT AT BRIXTON

In future the police must be thoroughly prepared for this type of situation

- The existing idea of the 'British Bobby', who is supposed to handle everything from traffic offences to urban terrorism, must be done away with and replaced by specialist police formations with their own specific spheres of responsibility.

I ought to expand on the latter point by detailing the main spheres I have in mind. Firstly, we would see the ordinary functions of 'civic' policing performed by the mainstream police force, as is presently the case. This means keeping order in public places on a day-to-day basis, with the main targets being burglary, mugging, vandalism, street crime, etc.

Traffic control and attendance to traffic offences should be completely taken away from this mainstream section of the police and entrusted to a separate Traffic Police, into which would be integrated the present parking wardens and highway patrols.

A separate plain-clothes Criminal Police, based mainly on the CID, should be established to combat organised crime and to deal with all aspects of investigation and detection.

Next, there should be a special paramilitary Riot Police, as in France. This force would exist to quell large-scale and serious civil disorder. It would be based in barracks

and would be much more an *élite* force. No more would ordinary constables have to face mob violence virtually untrained and unprotected.

Finally, there should be a police force responsible for all vital aspects of national security — integrating the Special Branch, MI5, MI6 and similar bodies. Not only would this force be responsible for internal security within Britain but its operations would extend to vital overseas functions on which internal security may depend, even if indirectly. Obviously, such a force must be highly 'politicised' from a nationalist standpoint and must, even more rigidly than other sections of the police, exclude any individuals of doubtful record and loyalty in this regard.

If I may summarise, the future nationalist revolution at which we aim will not be complete unless the police forces are in all respects thoroughly integrated into the nationalist state. This is not, as some may protest, in order to bring police power to bear to establish complete conformity and uniformity of political viewpoint, but to ensure that our tradition of political freedom — with its concomitant rights of free speech, free debate and free assembly — is not infiltrated and exploited by elements hostile and subversive to the British nation and people.

THE IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE between Capitalism and Socialism has been fought in our country for many years now, and a recent casualty in this conflict has been Britain's bus services. One of the dominant issues in the recent Metropolitan County Council elections was the question of bus fares, with many of the newly elected Labour Councils campaigning on a platform of cheap fares.

The councils cited South Yorkshire as an example of how heavily subsidised local bus services can result in many more people using cheap public transport. This may be true, but the situation has now been reached in South Yorkshire where even fully laden buses are running at a loss, and someone has to pay the bill. The council has raised this money by increasing the rates, and claims that if you use the bus regularly, the extra money you pay on the rates is actually less than if you paid higher bus fares. Whilst this may be true for regular bus users, what about those who don't use buses very often, and this does not necessarily mean well paid executives in cars but includes people who live close to their work, and hence either walk or ride a cycle. They are worse off by a substantial amount.

There is one other effect that South Yorkshire County Council does not boast about, and that is that the rates of local industry are also affected. This means that they are made less competitive by this fixed overhead that is out of their hands, and it will therefore, in the long term, result in a loss of profitability, and hence jobs. As the rates rise, new industry will fail to be attracted to the area, and a veritable industrial desert could well be created. How many people would have voted for a slogan of "cheap bus fares but no jobs"?

At the other extreme are the Conservative "if it isn't profitable, cut it" councils, and as these are largely rural councils, the country bus is now a fast dying breed. Perhaps the most striking example of this is in the area served by the National Bus Company subsidiary 'Alder Valley', which has cut the number of vehicles it operates by nearly one third in the last 12 months, and hence also the number of services it operates.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE INADEQUATE

Tory theory is that private enterprise will step in to fill the gaps thus created, but this is by no means always the case. Many villages have had their bus services totally withdrawn. It is hard for city dwellers to visualise what this means. Suddenly a quiet, peaceful village is turned into a repressive prison because, if you are too poor to own a car, a pensioner or a low paid worker, there is suddenly no way you can leave the village. You become reliant on the charity of others who will take you into town in their car if there happens to be a spare seat. For many this lack of mobility only makes their poverty worse, as they now have to do all

TROUBLE ON THE BUSES



The rural bus — a fast-dying breed

of their shopping in the more expensive village shop. The amount of money saved in these cutbacks is often small, but the cost in terms of human misery and suffering is large.

However, some of the cuts in rural transport are because of the debt repayments

by

DAVID BALL

the National Bus Company has to make. At the time of local government reorganisation, the Tory Government forced the NBC to borrow money to cover its unremunerative services until each new County Council could formulate its own transport policy, instead of giving it a temporary grant from central government funds. Now, as part of the present Government's plan to reduce public spending, the NBC has been told it has to make a profit, once the grants given to it by local councils to subsidise services in their area have been taken into account. But the profit it has to make is not just an operating profit, because it has to pay back this capital debt, a debt it was forced to take out.

At a time of economic depression, private companies reduce the dividend they pay out to stockholders, but the NBC has to pay out this money whether it can afford to or not, to the government, who lent it the money. The result on rural services has been catastrophic, with all the consequences outlined above. It is not even as if the amount of money involved were all that large, but to

the Government it has become a question of ideological principle.

So what is to be done about this sorry state of affairs? The time has now come for a nationally planned transport policy free from ideological conflict, but designed to suit the needs of the various regions of Britain. The human and economic effect of a bad local policy is now too great to be left in the hands of self-opinionated local councillors. For rural services, the aim should be simple, to provide as many villages as possible with a bus service, even if only very infrequent.

For cities the problem is somewhat more complex. Here the aim should be to maximise the use of public transport, without letting the cost of subsidy rise to an exorbitant level. The main problem is to combat the car mentality that has arisen in the last 20 years or so. Every morning the roads of our cities are choked with cars, many occupied by only one person. Traffic is slowed to a crawl, and valuable petrol is needlessly burnt up. Every effort ought to be made to persuade these people to travel to work by public transport, but heavy subsidies to keep fares artificially low is not the answer. Where the car gains over the bus is convenience, so efforts have to be made to make the use of buses more convenient. Reduction of car parking facilities, a large increase in the cost of city centre car parking and special 'bus only' lanes to reduce travelling times are all solutions that need to

Contd. on page 20

BRITAIN AND WEIMAR: HOW CLOSE THE PARALLEL?

DO CONDITIONS in contemporary Britain resemble exactly the conditions in Germany of the Weimar Republic? And should British nationalists employ the same strategy and tactics for winning power as German nationalists did half a century ago?

These are questions for legitimate discussion irrespective of whether one favours all the policies adopted by the German Nazis after power had been acquired. Our present national plight, and the possible ways out of it, are too serious a subject for debate to be allowed to descend to the level of arguments about gas chambers, real or fictitious. We must examine the problems faced by patriots of our own and other countries when confronted in the past with the forces of treason and decadence, and we must study objectively the avenues of action open to them and the forms of action they took. In this examination the yardstick of success or failure must play as important a role as a consideration of the similarity of circumstance.

Prima facie, the similarities between Germany of the Weimar period and Britain

of today are remarkable. Our present unemployment figure of 3 million is identical to the figure of unemployed in Germany in 1929. Add to this the chronic bouts of inflation that were constantly crippling the German economy in the Weimar period as they are our own today, with vast numbers of small businesses going to ruin and small investors losing their whole life's savings.

RED MENACE

The Germany of Weimar faced a frightening red menace in the form of violent gangs on the streets and in the factories, just as now beset Britain. One of the effects of this red presence was that nowhere could nationalists hold a meeting that was not certain to be attacked and broken up — unless adequate forces of self-defence were organised by the nationalists themselves.

SCENES FROM WEIMAR

Below: A demonstration in support of Spartacist leaders Liebknecht and Luxemburg; as in Britain today, many leaders of the far left were racial aliens. Below left: one of the millions of victims of unemployment and inflation in Germany in 1923.


Germany's *Rotfront* particularly resented the nationalist message getting over to the labouring classes, which it regarded as its exclusive preserve, and any nationalist demonstration, meeting or march that pitched its appeal especially to the 'masses' was bound to come in for especially violent treatment on the part of Marxist mobs — a situation with which we are all too familiar.

Most of the humbler classes in Germany were indeed under the influence of left-wing parties. This was in no small way due to the fact the politicians of the 'Right' had lost all touch with those classes and could offer them no policies that pointed to a way out

JOHN TYNDALL looks back at a controversial but instructive era of European history

of their misery. 'Conservative' political forces in the Weimar Republic were seen as, and in large part were, merely the political arm of the entrepreneurial section of the population dedicated only to the protection

Contd. on next page



of their own business and financial interests. 'Conservatism' was also marked by a depressing political cowardice, so much so that Conservatives only spoke to enclosed meetings of their own kind and dared not venture out to make contact with the working folk who had fallen largely under the spell of Marxism — or at least voted habitually for parties that were in whole or in part Marxist.

Broadly the same position pertains in modern Britain.

Cultural life in the Germany of Weimar period, like that in our own country today, had become almost a monopoly of leftist intellectuals and artistic confidence-tricksters. It was in Weimar that the Bauhaus school of architecture and design which foreshadowed the hideous designs of our own day first took firm root, and it is no coincidence that the artistic degenerates of our own day in Britain look to the Germany of Weimar as being a society outstanding in its artistic richness and creativity.

HOMOSEXUAL CLUBS

Moral and sexual depravity in the post-1918 period reached its most extreme development in the Germany of Weimar, especially in Berlin, where homosexual clubs and pick-up points became commonplace and where men sitting at bars dressed and made up as women were an everyday sight. There are perhaps two places in the world today where this sort of life thrives to a comparable degree. One is San Francisco. The other is London.

In Germany of the Weimar period, just as in Britain today, by far the greater part of the communications media was in the hands of internationalists, liberals and racial aliens — so much so that Hitler was forced to comment at that time that there was hardly a newspaper in the whole of Germany that could truly be called national.

The alien presence was of course felt much further afield as well. Apart from their heavy penetration of the world of journalism, Jews in Germany had achieved a dominance in the theatre and the world of popular entertainment and were enormously powerfully represented in a number of the leading professions, particularly the law. Needless to say, they were also to be found in large numbers among the leadership of left-wing political groups. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the principals of the Spartacist uprising in Berlin in 1918, were both Jews, as was Kurt Eisner, President of the short lived Soviet Republic of Bavaria at around the same time. Such a picture is familiar to observers of the British scene in 1981, with the additional factor that did not exist in the Weimar period: the massive presence of Blacks and Asians in the inner city areas.

To those leading the forces of national rebirth in the Germany of post-1918, the political strategy that presented itself as the most realistic was to go flat out to win the



MEN OF INFLUENCE

Goering (left), Von Epp (centre) and Pöhner (right) helped Hitler on his way to power.

'toiling masses' of the working class. First of all, these represented the most numerous element in the German electorate. Secondly, they were the hardest hit by the economic adversity encountered in the country at the time. Thirdly, they had, as such, the least to lose and provided ready made raw material for whichever revolutionary movement was best able to recruit them and organise them for its purpose. In the beginning this was the Communists, but their techniques were in time copied, and in some cases improved upon, by the Nazis.

It was no accident that in this situation Hitler's party adopted the word 'Socialist' as part of its title and proclaimed that its ideal was 'German Socialism' — as distinct from the International Socialism of the Left. Party members were encouraged to come to meetings in their everyday working clothes, so as to create the greatest possible 'proletarian' atmosphere whereby former adherents of left-wing parties may be made to feel 'at home'. The colour red predominated in the party's visual propaganda.

These facts, and the fact that the German Nazis were successful in winning power within 14 years of their formation in Munich in 1919, have led a number of present-day British nationalists to believe that the prescription of 'proletarian' nationalism, embellished by much of the dressing and rhetoric of the left, constitutes the correct strategy for a movement of national rebirth in our country in the 1980s, and that, like those Germans of the Weimar period, we should concentrate all-out on winning support among the 'working class' — if necessary to the point of alienation of other sections of the population.

These people show that they have given some study to National Socialism. They also show that they have only half studied it.

THE DIFFERENCES

So far in this article I have spotlighted the similarities between modern Britain and the Germany of 1918-1933. It is now the time to analyse the differences, and the differences are considerable.

Notwithstanding what has been said about the calibre of 'right-wing' and 'reactionary' political parties in Weimar Germany, the fact remains that the middle and upper classes of that country and period still contained very large and influential elements that were nationally orientated and had not fallen victim to the seductions of 'liberalism'. These sections of the populace were very close in spirit to the broader nationalist and patriotic principles of the Nazi Party, even if it took a little persuasion to win them over to some aspects of the party's programme and tactics.

This could be seen in the strong support that the party had, right from the beginning, among the officer corps of the military and among many of the wealthiest and most aristocratic circles in Munich, where it began its first activities. Hitler very quickly became more than just the demagogue of street rallies and beer halls; he was also exceedingly well received in Munich high society, from which before long substantial sums of money began to flow into his party's coffers.

So closely were Hitler and the main part of the Nazi leadership in tune with the nationalistic and authoritarian sentiments of these sections of the population and so carefully did he contrive to cultivate their loyalty and confidence that it was not too difficult to persuade them of the 10 per-cent of the Nazi programme that at first they had perhaps not fully understood, namely the need to offer social and economic reforms that would win the masses away from Marxism and build a unified German national community. Indeed, bearing in mind the profoundly greater political awareness of many of Germany's upper social stratum, a great number of people belonging to that stratum were already capable of working that simple fact out for themselves.

German nationalism thus had, right from the beginning, a vast reservoir of support among those classes best able to help it financially and likely, by way of their qualifications and ability, to be occupying key positions in the apparatus of state and the economy.

Contd. overleaf

BRITAIN AND WEIMAR

(Contd. from prev. page)

The German armed forces in World War I had in total mobilised some 9 million men. Allowing for the high casualty rate suffered in the war, the greater part of that number still survived to be demobilised at its end. Herein lay a huge pool of potential support for a movement of nationalism pledged to fight by political means for the victory that had eluded the soldiers in the trenches and which many of them felt had been dashed from their grasp by the internal 'stab in the back' that had been perpetrated in Germany on the home front in the last months of the war in the form of the Marxist-organised General Strike.

Substantial numbers of these men from the trenches were never able to settle down in civilian life after the war, not only because of the difficult temperamental adjustment involved but also because the state of the economy was such that there just was not room for them in the normal civilian occupations. Revolutionary ferment within the country, mainly of the left-wing variety, was so great that the Government of the time — notwithstanding its 'Social Democratic' pedigree — was forced to call upon many of these men to form armed brigades to put down red uprisings where they occurred or threatened to occur. These brigades came to be known as *Freikorps* and in large part were the forerunners of the Nazi SA and SS.

THE RIGHT MEN

Great numbers of men were thus available to swell the ranks of the infant National Socialist Party which were of the very kind the party most needed: tough, courageous, militarily trained and used to discipline. In the many officers amongst them were the cadres ready to assume leadership at all levels in the party. Two of the most distinguished of these were Captain Hermann Goering, a much decorated wartime air ace, and General Franz Ritter Von Epp. There were literally hundreds of lesser eminence, and in addition the party was able for a time to enjoy the open support of the greatest of all the nation's war heroes, General Erich Von Ludendorff.

It can thus be seen that the proletarian element recruited through the socialistic-sounding slogans which echoed in the beer halls and often dominated the wall posters comprised only one strand in the young and developing Nazi movement. It was never to have as much influence as the ex-service element; in numbers it never achieved the potential that was hoped for it; and at no time did it provide the party with many leaders.

Friends and allies in high places were at all times in its career vital to the survival and

growth of the party of Adolf Hitler. One of these was Ernst Pöchner, at one time Police President of Munich. Another was his assistant and head of the police's political department, Wilhelm Frick. Frick held his office at the time that the Nazis were engaged in the abortive Putsch of 1923 and he saw to it that they were informed in advance of any police moves to counter their activities.

When the Putsch failed and Hitler was hauled into court, a major factor in his being permitted to use the trial as a political platform and subsequently being given an extraordinarily mild sentence was that Judge Neithardt, who presided over the trial was an ardent nationalist and was, to quote John Toland in his biography of the German Fuhrer, "convinced . . . that the Putsch was a 'national deed'." Throughout the trial, said Toland, the Judge made things as difficult as possible for the prosecution and its witnesses and as favourable as possible for the defendants.

These circumstances will seem strange, indeed almost unbelievable, to those familiar with the British scene today. Observing the recent behaviour of a Judge to a defendant accused merely of publishing material offensive to coloured immigrants, the mind boggles at the thought of how that defendant would have been treated had he stood trial for organising an armed uprising against the state and been accused, as Hitler was in 1924, of High Treason!

As the Nazi Movement grew and developed, it would, it was hoped, obtain substantial support from and in the trade unions. In fact this support always fell far short of expectations. On the other hand, the party gradually achieved a tremendous following among university students, and many German universities of the time were as much exclusive Nazi strongholds as most British universities today are exclusive strongholds of the far left. A cause of this was that nationalism was still a powerful sentiment among those types of German that became university undergraduates, and an effect of it was that the Nazis benefitted from a regular flow of talented young men from out of the universities who were able to fill executive positions in the party and place at its disposal an increasing richness of talents — also to take their place in those echelons of society where they could help the Nazi cause indirectly by means of the influence they wielded. While university education at that time was becoming open to the more talented young folk from poorer backgrounds, entry to the universities still came predominantly from the middle and upper classes of Germany.

It was in the election of 1930 that the Nazis advanced from being a minority party to one with a real mass following, increasing their votes throughout Germany from a previous 810,000 to 6,371,000 and their seats in the Reichstag from 12 to 107. This spectacular leap forward was of course

accomplished in the midst of the world depression and at a time when unemployment in Germany was growing alarmingly. These facts may at first sight lend credence to the theory that the working class vote was mainly responsible for the Nazis' rapid rise during that period.

SOURCE OF SUPPORT

The theory, however, would not be correct. An analysis of where the votes of the NSDAP came from shows that they were obtained mainly at the expense of those parties that traditionally had drawn their support largely from the German bourgeoisie. Principal among these was the conservative *Volkspartei*, which saw its vote cut from 14.3 per-cent of the total to only 7 per-cent. Considerable gains were also made at the expense of the Catholic Centre Party. The Communists, on the other hand, increased their support by 1,326 votes and the largest party, the Social Democrats, lost no more than 60,000 votes. To quote Toland again:—

"Hitler's gains had come mainly at the expense of the middle-class parties. The most sensational Nazi increase was among the farmers and lower middle class in the rural and Protestant areas in the Northern half of the country, but considerable gains were also made among Catholics. In the days before the Beer Hall Putsch Hitler had sought almost exclusively for the dissident, disenchanted desperation vote. Now he had received support from people who expected him to bring them better lives. It was Hitler's elastic appeal and forceful oratory which had attracted the new voters but it was the tireless work of thousands of cell leaders and cell foremen in the party's efficient vertical organisation that had got them to the polls."

The last mentioned factor was not without considerable importance. These local leaders were not primarily of proletarian background but came mainly from the middle and lower middle classes. Almost certainly more of them were refugees from conservatism than from the left; they were people of some education and used to bearing responsibility. Even those of the humblest of origins had worked their way up to own small businesses and were capable of organising, making decisions and using their brains.

107 seats in the Reichstag represented a tremendous gain, but it did not as yet represent power for Hitler. This was to come slightly more than 2 years later after a rapid series of elections, both to the Reichstag and to the Presidency. In the Reichstag elections of July 31st 1932 the party more than doubled its seats, to 230. But Hitler still, in the words of biographer Joachim Fest:—

" . . . had not been able to make significant inroads on the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party. All that tremendous propaganda effort, the incessant mass meetings, parades, poster and leaflet distributions . . . all of it had brought the party an increase of 1 per-cent compared with the vote for the Prussian Landtag."

The electoral gains had again been made

Contd. on next page

mainly at the expense of the same parties as in 1930. In the meantime both these elections and those to the Presidency in which Hitler stood against Field Marshal Hindenburg required vast sums of money for the Nazis to compete in them effectively. These sums were only made available by a series of agreements made with some of the leading titans of German commerce and industry. Support in these quarters could not possibly have been won had the Nazis not been able to offer a number of concrete benefits to the donors and had Hitler not rejected the demands of those within his own party who agitated for a more socialistic programme.

LEFT-WING FACTION

These demands were coming from a left-wing faction headed by the brothers Gregor and Otto Strasser, which at one point in the party's development seriously threatened to split it in two. One major issue of contention arose when Otto Strasser called in his newspaper for support of the Saxon metalworkers' strike in April 1930. Had the party taken such a line, it would certainly have alienated powerful figures in industry, such as Fritz Thyssen of the United Steel Works, who provided large subsidies for the Nazis' electoral campaigns.

Another issue that threatened to split the right and left of the Nazi Party was the proposal for the confiscation of the bankrupt estates of Prussian Junkers in East Germany. Hitler infuriated some of his more 'radical' party colleagues by opposing this proposal, but his position almost certainly played a major part in winning him the confidence of President Hindenburg, which was vital in securing him the post of Chancellor on January 30th 1933.

It is not the place here to debate the moral and ideological merits of the conflict between Hitler and the left-wing 'Strasserite' element in the Nazi Party, only to say that had the latter emerged victorious the party would never have come within a sniff of political power. That power rested, from the earliest beginnings of the party right through to the moment when Hitler, standing on the balcony of the Reich's Chancellery, took the triumphal salute of victory, on the massive support that the Nazis were able to obtain among those elements in German society that comprised the leading spirits of the nation: the heads of the Army; the professional and business classes; the officials of the civil service and police; and at least a part of the academic and cultural *élite*.

Certainly power would not have been possible either had the party not managed to win over a not insubstantial part of the working masses, both on land and in factory. How much the 'Socialism' in National Socialism contributed to this is difficult to judge, for many among those classes would never have succumbed to the internationalist poison offered up by the Marxists — irrespective of the propaganda of the NSDAP — but



GREGOR STRASSER

Had his prescriptions been adopted, the Nazis would have stood no hope of coming to power.

would have supported the most dynamic leader able to stir the forces of nationalism within the country.

But no apparatus capable of recruiting and organising mass support would ever have been built had the party's appeal been confined to the 'desperation vote', as Toland described it, and had recruitment come primarily from the least accomplished, least capable, least distinguished and socially and economically weakest parts of German society.

That there was then a healthy residue of nationalistic feeling within that layer of the

German nation with the aptitude for, and access to, everything that we mean by the term 'power' is the factor that stands in sharp contrast to the situation in modern Britain, where such classes are abysmally lacking even in an understanding of the meaning of such a sentiment.

IMMENSE TASK IN BRITAIN

Whatever the importance of nationalists striking roots among the mass of ordinary working folk of this country — and I have never been one to deny that importance — all this will be futile activity if it is pursued to the detriment of winning adherents to the nationalist ideal among the wealthier, higher ranking and more powerful sections of society. The task facing us here is immense, for the spiritual rot that permeates Britain today is deepest of all in that quarter.

With those upper and middle echelons of society that have reached middle age, there is probably very little now that can be done. They do contain some elements that might be designated as 'patriotic Conservatives' and who, with the increasing breakdown of the system, may yet be persuaded that Conservatism — even of the better type — is inadequate. However, the profit that can come to the nationalist cause from these people is very limited.

What we can and must do is make an intense effort to reach the younger elements among these parts of society, that is to say the people who are likely to be occupying the commanding heights of the nation's life in 10 to 20 years' time. A long while ago our opponents of the left recognised this necessity and invested massive effort and resources in the task; now they are reaping the dividends.

While I have said that our work among the masses should not be pursued to the detriment of winning support among the more powerful, neither should we do the reverse. Both fields are important. Nevertheless, we will certainly fail to achieve the desired harmony of both objectives if we fall into the trap of adopting the idiotic prescriptions of the latter-day imitators of Gregor and Otto Strasser, for these belong, like liberalism, to the airy-fairy world of ideological dreams and abstractions that are divorced from the facts of real politics.

Returning to the German scene, it could be argued that later errors of the German leadership in the foreign and military field led to ultimate defeat and destruction for the national revolution in that country. Many will argue that Nazi power was ultimately corrupted by departures from civilised morality without parallel in history. Those arguments, however, belong to another chapter in the story. We are concerned here with Weimar — both as a period in European history and as a phrase to describe later societies which show similar mortal symptoms. Yes, we live in times like Weimar in many ways, but the parallel is not an exact one; historical parallels hardly ever are.

Helena Rubinstein and the cosmetics defalcation

"My life for booty"

My Life for Beauty is what cosmetician Helena Rubinstein actually called her career retrospection. I call it usurpation -- the title as well as the career -- and the West's great poets testify with one voice in my behalf. To a man, they insist that true human beauty lies not in paint or plaster or any dead media, but in living flesh and bone. If a search in Rubinstein's books for concepts like "nature" and "somatotype" is foredoomed, then "breeding" and "eugenics" are unthinkable. Simply stated, there's no money in them -- for the individual.

It would warm my cockles to report that "Madame" died with a night table piled high with the collected works of Hans F.K. Günther, Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, or -- let us be fair -- some human aesthetician more to her racial choosing. But the impulse which actually overtook the Lysenko of the beauty business in her last delirious days chills me in places that even a New England winter never penetrated. As a boundless anxiety consumed the dying woman, she ran her fingers unceasingly over and through the gold coins which she hoarded by her side. Whether this compulsion signified a futile attempt to instill life in the coins or in herself "only her [psychoanalyst] knows for sure."

In vino veritas. And in delirium no less.

Helena Rubinstein amassed her gold coins by telling plain and ugly women that nose jobs, face lifts and all manner of weird pasty applications can transform their aesthetic beings in a decisive way. And while there is always a place in the world, and a large one at that, for sincere tact and generosity, one must question the motives of self-styled beautilongers who show not the least concern that the proportion of the world's women (and men) whose defective natures require ever more radical artificial cures is demonstrably soaring -- who would, in fact, be enraged by the suggestion that even 1/100 of 1% of their profits be diverted to reversing the trend toward physical degeneracy among the harridans who fill their coffers.

"How did she look?" asks Rubinstein biographer Maxene Fabe. "Barbaric." Four feet, ten inches tall, with black eyes, blood-red lipstick and nail polish, several pounds of jewelry -- and an "uncommonly good complexion." She "rarely fol-



lowed her own beauty advice." Her secretary, Patrick O'Higgins, observed:

In death [at 94], she seemed to have shrunk . . . to the size of a small doll . . . It was said that a great part of Madame's huge success with the American public -- particularly with Jewish women who were some of her principal customers -- was due to the fact that she was so small, dumpy, old.

What was she like? Driven, workaholic, "possessed by demons," as she put it. Extremely touchy, easily slighted, impulsive and compulsive, prone to a violent temper which swiftly passed. Her husband Edward Titus created the famous Helena Rubinstein persona, the "elegant, rich, and cultured high priestess of beauty." A poll found her to be the best-known woman in Depression America.

WORTH MILLIONS

Her net worth? Over \$100 million, perhaps \$200 million, at her death in 1965, with 32,000 on her payroll. "Money's a curse!" she was fond of exclaiming. Yet she used it (as she

Contd. on next page

could not have used her own nature) to manipulate others. "I can't help making money," she almost lamented. Biographer Fabe writes, "It poured in because she convincingly promised millions of women . . . that they did not have to be born beautiful in order to be beautiful." Even during the Depression, the cosmetics industry -- all but nonexistent a generation earlier -- was reckoned the sixth largest in America, with over 100,000 employees catering to the beauty whims of American women. Rubinstein introduced male cosmetics in 1941. But till her dying day she never catered to black skin.

What was her product worth? Fabe:

Cosmetics cost little to make, but a woman feels more glamorous buying something excessively priced; the markup is often as much as 900 percent . . . Now although Helena Rubinstein religiously believed in her products, she was also realistic enough to know that basically there is little if any difference between cosmetics, no matter who makes them or for what price they sell.

Competitors? She came to New York in 1915, following business triumphs in Australia and Europe. Elizabeth Arden had arrived six years earlier. Fabe again:

[Arden] was a fluttery, seemingly helpless woman. Her image was blonde, chaste, virginal. Pink was her favorite color -- pink and gold. She catered to the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant ideal of feminine beauty -- golden country-club blondes who went to hunt breakfasts on dewy mornings, played golf, and belonged to garden clubs -- quite in contrast to Helena Rubinstein's bizarre sense of the beautiful. The two women would never meet, but Elizabeth Arden was known to say that Rubinstein products were -- well, for those dark people . . . [T]here began a grim competition.

The final outcome, in twentieth-century America, may have been a foregone conclusion. By the mid-60s, Rubinstein stood fourth behind Avon, Revlon (Charles Revson) and Max Factor in a then \$7 billion a year business. Another competitor, Estee Lauder, would soon be personally worth nearly \$200 million. Elizabeth Arden was in danger of becoming a memory.

Stunted though it was beside her sales hype, "Madame" had a more observant side. In *This Way to Beauty* (1936), she

or a ghost-writer makes the following observations (on page 147):

Just how much of beauty is God-given, and how much of it is mother-given, is a puzzle. For modern mothers are cultivating nerves and noses as assiduously as their grandmothers did minds and characters . . . [T]he measure to which (beauty) mounts in the teens and twenties is most frequently determined by the beauty rites mothers employ during the first few years.

Inconsistency on this critical question is pervasive in Rubinstein's work. After saying we can never know how much of beauty is innate, she will unabashedly maintain that the woman with the "new, tender plant called hope" (and a full purse) can achieve absolutely anything. This apparent stalemate between the eugenic and euthenic approaches to personal beauty is actually quite revealing. There are billions of dollars riding on the efficacy of one approach and exactly zero dollars on the other.

Even the nurture crowd must know a few basics of nature. Fabe again:

Very quickly [Rubinstein] . . . saw that an English complexion was not the same as a French one. The English skin was very delicate, given to wrinkles and red splotches.

While London's Nordics were cool to makeup, the Parisian Alpines were "prepared to wallow in powder and paint" and needed education toward subtlety and away from garishness.

Apparently, Nordicism pays so long as it is the kind that assures Everywoman she can be an ideal Nordic. *Helena Rubinstein's Book of the Sun*, published in 1979, included about seven or eight minorityites among the ten on its production staff. Yet it is a paean to Nordic beauty, virtually every drawing and photo depicting the same blond type. The "aesthetic prop" is there for all to see except no body-mind-behavior correlations are stated or examined, and women who weren't born Nordic may become Nordic by following directions. Thus, the biological interest of the Helena Rubinsteins never goes beyond the point needed to bring in the bucks.

Reproduced with acknowledgements to INSTAURATION, Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Florida 32920, U.S.A.

QUO VADIS CASSETTE SERVICE

A monthly commentary on world affairs which exposes the international drama in which all free nations are held hostage to the one-world conspiracy. Annual air-mail subscription: £26.50. Half-yearly subscription: £13.25. Free catalogue available. Single copies £3 each. Write to P.O. Box 830, Honeydew 2040, South Africa.

NEWS OF THE NEW WORLD

Small bi-monthly news journal. Air-mail £3. Surface mail £1.50 per annum. Sample copies available. From P.O. Box 830, Honeydew 2040, South Africa.

ANTI-I.R.A. BOOKLET: Savagery and suffering, by Peter Robinson. £1 only (inc. p & p) from D. King, 64 Tottenham Lane, London N. 8.

FLAGS — FLAGS — FLAGS

Send stamp for list. W. Brown, 20 Sutton Way, Heston, Middlesex TW5 0JA.

LEAGUE REVIEW

For a new view on human affairs read *League Review*, journal of the League of St. George. This is a 24-page pictorial magazine costing 45p. Subscription rate is £5 for 8 issues (British Isles). For sample send 60p to: *League Review*, 9/11 Kensington High Street, London W8 5NP.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

THE TRAIL THAT LEADS BACK TO PAWSONS ROAD

THE OLD NATIONAL FRONT, we are informed, has now moved its National Headquarters back to No. 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, from whence it departed in some haste and under some considerable pressure at the beginning of 1976.

The events that led to this departure are a matter of record which all nationalists would do well to study. In the Winter of 1975/76 there was staged an attempt to take over the National Front by a process of conspiracy and intrigue not greatly different to that of 1979 and which involved practices that were totally unconstitutional and, as later determined by a court, illegal.

This take-over bid followed a period of constant internal warfare within the party that had begun in 1974 and in which a subversive faction that came to be known as the 'Populists' had increased its power in the party to the point of winning about half the seats on the Directorate, including that of the Chairman. This faction comprised people of dubious political background and motives, and almost certainly included some who had been placed in the party for destructive purposes by the enemies of nationalism.

As 1975 drew towards its close, this faction decided the time had come to make its control of the party absolute, and it began a series of manoeuvres to that end which were to earn its practitioners the reprobation of one of Britain's most eminent judges. Mr. John Kingsley Read, then Chairman of the Directorate and nominal head of the faction, attempted to have all his opponents on the Directorate expelled from the party by the fantastic device of obtaining a decision by the party's Executive Council (which the faction controlled by means of his own casting vote) to put them all on 'disciplinary charges'. They were in the meantime all placed under 'suspension' by decision of the Executive Council and thus deemed to be ineligible to attend the next meeting of the Directorate at which there would be a vote to ratify the Council's decision to charge and suspend them!

CROOKEDNESS AND CORRUPTION

This affair provided an earlier example of the sheer crookedness and corruption that is liable always to be introduced into party affairs when everything is decided by 'majority' voting. Anyhow, Mr. Read and his friends were in the short term able to get away with their dishonest manoeuvre

NF wreckers, past and present, renew partnership

because they had another vital card that they were able to play.

This was their effective control of the party's Headquarters building. This control was made possible by the fact that the building was owned by a man who called himself 'Gordon Brown' but whose real name was Gordon Marshall. Brown (Marshall) was almost certainly the chief brain and wirepuller behind the activities of the subversive faction within the party, although Read was his official senior in party rank. Brown (Marshall) had exhibited his talent for intrigue some years earlier when he had played a major part in the conspiracy against the National Front's founder, A. K. Chesterton, which led to Mr. Chesterton leaving the party. Somehow Brown (Marshall) had managed to retain his place in the party following this unpleasant episode, mainly because that place was protected by the Constitution, which allowed his removal only by decision of a majority of the Directorate, on which body he had many friends. Now he was to be seen again at the centre of intrigue and conspiracy in the party, this time exploiting to the full the leverage given to him by his ownership of the party's premises.

Simultaneous to the 'suspension' of half the Directorate by Mr. Read and his Executive Council, Brown (Marshall) entered the building used by the party and had the locks changed on the front door, giving keys to the new lock only to those officials of the party who were supporters of his own and Read's faction. The 'suspended' members of the Directorate were thus physically prevented from entering the building and gaining access to the membership lists whereby they could communicate with the members of the party and expose the conspiracy that was being enacted. In the meantime, using those membership lists, the faction that had seized control circularised the members with their own (totally dishonest) version of events. The hi-jacking of the party seemed complete.

It was not to be, however. The 'suspended' members of the Directorate thereupon took their case to the High Court and obtained an injunction from the judge

obliging Read, Brown (Marshall) & Co. to reinstate them as members of the Directorate and the party, as well as to grant them proper access to the party's Headquarters building and membership lists. The game was up and, seeing this, Read, Brown (Marshall) & Co. put the second part of their plan into operation. They left the party and attempted to set up a splinter group outside it, appealing to the members to join them by using their own lists, copied from the original lists during the time that the latter had been in their sole possession. Their venture failed totally. Very few members answered their call and their splinter party went into oblivion a year or so later.

THE ROLE OF MR. 'BROWN'

In the midst of this period of emergency, Mr. Martin Webster, one of the 'suspended' Directorate members, issued an internal bulletin to branch organisers of the party with the instruction that the contents should be made known by those organisers to their local members. The bulletin outlined the manoeuvres that had been employed by the subversive 'Populist' faction to take over the party and it spoke thus of the role of Mr. Gordon Brown (Marshall):—

"On Monday, 29th December, Mr. Gordon 'Brown' (real name Marshall) burst into the office premises together with a gang of thugs — only one of whom, apart from 'Brown', was an NF member. At that time only Mr. Webster, Mrs. Sandra McKenzie, her daughter Susan, and Mrs. Rose Weatherall were in the building. Mr. Webster was assaulted and then man-handled out of the building, as was Mrs. McKenzie. Mrs. McKenzie was thrown out of the building by the thugs with such force that her head sustained minor injuries as it hit the pavement. Susan McKenzie and Mrs. Weatherall were then terrorised into leaving the premises. Thereupon Mr. 'Brown' and his thugs changed the front door lock. Mr. 'Brown' announced that he was the owner of the premises and was repossessing his property . . ."

Mr. Webster expanded somewhat on the role of Brown (Marshall) in an article printed at about the same time in *Spearhead*, detailing the take-over bid. In this article he said:—

" . . . These tensions were, in my view, in the first place the creation of a man known as 'Gordon Brown' who over the years has patiently built up a faction which has one purpose: to eliminate Nationalists from the leadership of the National Front, and to replace them with opportunists. Brown himself is a man of the shadows, and his real name is believed to be Marshall.

Contd. on next page

"Mr. Brown is the owner of the building which has been used by the NF as its Head Office . . ."

"It was Mr. Brown who, in 1970, set up the Action Committee which organised a coup against the first NF Chairman, Mr. A. K. Chesterton. This was forced through by means of the simple expedient of Mr. Brown's associates removing from the NF Head Office, then at Fleet Street, all the party's membership files!"

These facts about Mr. Brown (Marshall) were nothing more or less than the truth. It was almost unanimously recognised by the reinstated Directorate members who once again took over and proceeded to rebuild the party that Brown (Marshall) had been the most sinister and shadowy of a number of sinister and shadowy characters who had worked to disrupt the party from the inside, both in 1970 and more recently, and that in the latter event a key factor contributing to the pull over party affairs exerted by Brown (Marshall) was his ownership of the party's office building at 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon. The decision was made to move to another premises as quickly as possible and this was duly done, the party setting up offices in Teddington, Middlesex, very shortly afterwards.

At a later meeting of the National Directorate, chaired once again by John Tyndall, who had been restored to the party leadership following the defeat and exit of the Populist faction, it was resolved to draw up a list of persons who had been regarded as the chief troublemakers in the internal strife that had racked the party during the previous year or two and to resolve that these persons be permanently **proscribed** by the party.

At this point it should be mentioned what was meant by the term 'proscribed'. In all definitions of the term that were ever discussed by the Directorate, the 'proscription' of a person meant, not only that he or she be denied party membership, **but that the party should desist from any association, contact or business with that person in any shape or form.** Indeed, no other definition of 'proscription' made any sense, nor does it make any sense today.

At the very top of the list of proscribed persons, and by almost unanimous vote of the Directorate including the vote of Mr. Martin Webster, was Mr. Gordon Brown (Marshall).

RESURGENCE

Following the exit from the party of Read, Marshall (Brown) and their associates, the National Front then experienced a tremendous resurgence, picking up strength during 1976 and 1977 to such an extent that it became possible that the party might be able to achieve the extraordinary feat of putting up as many as 300 candidates in the next General Election.

As everyone now knows, this feat was indeed achieved in the General Election of May 1979. It was after that election had

come and gone that a new bout of internal troubles began to hit the NF once again. These troubles have been described at some length and in some detail in past issues of *Spearhead* and there is no need here to relate them again in their entirety.

Suffice it to say that matters reached a point at the beginning of 1980 at which John Tyndall, as head of the NF, came to the conclusion that a state of emergency existed within the party with which he could only deal if he were granted much stronger leadership powers than he had hitherto been allowed under the party's Constitution, and that these powers should extend to giving him the prerogative, where necessary, to overrule the Directorate in the appointment and dismissal of senior party officers. The most immediate matter calling for action by Mr. Tyndall in this regard was the discovery of a network of homosexuality within the party that was rapidly destroying it. The central and principal figure in this network was Martin Webster.

Mr. Tyndall made it clear to the Directorate at a meeting in January 1980 that either he be given these increased powers or he would resign. The Directorate refused to co-operate and Mr. Tyndall resigned.

DIVISION ONCE AGAIN

Once again a serious division opened up within the party. Mr. Tyndall's supporters, who were few on the Directorate but many in the party, predicted that without his leadership the party would not recover from its difficulties but would sink into an ever deeper decline. The majority of the Directorate and its supporters, on the other hand, proclaimed that this would not happen and announced in a members' bulletin: "**The National Front lives to rebuild in the 1980s!**"

By September of 1980 some evidence had appeared as to who might be right. In the annual elections to the National Directorate taking place in that month the most successful candidate obtained 567 votes — compared with the same elections a year previously in which the most successful candidate had obtained 1,528 votes.

Since it is probable that, year by year, a roughly similar proportion of the total membership of the party (always a minority) bothers to vote in these elections, it is possible to obtain from the figures above some kind of barometer of the rise or fall of the party during any year. In fact the fall was frightening. **The figures indicate that party strength in September 1980 was not very greatly more than a third of what it was in September 1979.**

Very recently the 1981 Directorate elections took place. On this occasion NF Headquarters took the unprecedented step of not announcing publicly the numbers of votes obtained by the candidates but only announced percentages of the total vote that each received.

The party's marches and other public

activities have revealed the same trend. At a march in London early in 1980 the attendance totalled about 1,700 — and this **after** the defections of some members to the so-called 'National Front Constitutional Movement' and 'British Democratic Party', thus showing that those defections had not taken away any really substantial numbers of activists. At a rally taking place in London in September 1981, which was preceded by extensive pre-publicity, **an estimated 300 took part.**

This alarming decline in numerical support has gone hand in hand with a depressing decline in the **quality** of much of the membership. The Directorate of the NF, having failed to retain the loyalty of so many of the better elements that supported the party in the Tyndall period, has turned increasingly to those sections of society that a party of national resurgence can best do without: the refuse from the football grounds and the freaks and weirdos to be seen in abundance at 'punk rock' concerts. The level of the party's literature has reflected this new trend, glorifying soccer hooligans and identifying with everything that is trashy, degenerate and subhuman on the popular music scene.

This of course all reflects a mood of desperation on the part of those now running the party. Recruits have to come from somewhere to maintain the image of an organisation that is still 'active'. Money has to come from somewhere to fill the depleted party coffers and maintain the office staff. The dilemma is obvious.

ONLY COURSE LEFT

In this situation of crisis there is a course of action that is apparent to every rationally thinking nationalist and it is indeed the only course by which the National Front can be saved from total eclipse. This is to acknowledge the disastrous mistake that was made in January 1980 and allow the healthy elements in the party — among the rank-and-file still probably the majority — to open up negotiations with John Tyndall and his supporters with a view to the party being reunified on the terms which he proposed and the Directorate rejected at that time. Many honourable people in the party have recognised this is the only solution; after opposing Tyndall at first, they have realised their mistake and have crossed over to support him. They are the people with the strength of character and the necessary infusion of nationalist spirit to put the good of the party before their own personal egos and pride. They are increasing in number all the time as this article goes to print.

But for the Directorate and its dwindling circle of diehards such a course is quite out of the question. The road determined upon in January 1980 must be stuck to at all

Contd. on page 20

When the nation's business stopped for Mr. Singh

ONE OF THE ARTS of good government is, or should be, the organisation of political affairs so as to enable the people's leaders to give the very maximum concentration of their minds to the truly serious affairs of state. The running of a highly developed and larger than average modern nation is a complex and difficult business and can only be undertaken effectively if there is a sensible division of spheres whereby matters calling for the attention of officialdom are discussed at levels graded according to their national importance. Political leaders are after all only human beings who have to fit the nation's business into those hours of the day or night that are available when the necessary time for sleep, food, relaxation and reflection have been allocated. This means that they cannot possibly interest themselves in every matter that their fellow citizens bring before them; some prudent order of priorities has to be established, and this order must dictate that national leaders — as distinct from town and county councillors, civil servants and other sundry petty bureaucrats — occupy their time with those issues fundamental to national prosperity and survival.

When vital hours and minutes of this time are spent giving attention to trivia, the nation is clearly not functioning at full efficiency. When such trivia occupies the time, not just of one national leader, but of several hundred sitting in the nation's senior discussion and debating chamber, the conduct of national affairs has surely reached the stage of farce.

IN THE COMMONS

This is the thought that springs to mind when one reads of the case of Mr. Pritam Singh, an Indian gentleman of some 25 or more years' residence in this country, which was brought to the attention of the House of Commons on the 24th July by his local MP, Mr. Peter Archer, the member for Warley West.

Said Mr. Archer, opening his speech about Mr. Singh: "One of the more attractive features of the House is its capacity to range within a single day from a debate of global importance to the problem of an individual."

Attractive, perhaps. But conducive to the efficacy of government, definitely not. However, let Mr. Archer continue. Mr.

Pritam Singh, it appears, is his constituent and by all accounts a good and upright citizen. His problem is that, like many people who change their country of residence, he retains links with his country of origin. To be specific, he has an ageing father living back in India, and spends much of his time caring for the old gentleman and looking after his affairs. This means that he has to spend some considerable time in India, and away from Britain, where his wife and family live.

Now what is the position of the law concerning cases such as that of Mr. Singh? Is he in fact classified as a resident of the United Kingdom or India? And what is his right of entry into this country after he has lived some time in the country of his origin and of his father? Apparently the law says that such a person is given indefinite leave to enter the UK if he has lived here before and if he has been out of the country for less than 2 years.

But it is quite obvious that a great many members of the immigrant community in Britain have made an ass of the law. What they have done is make regular trips back to their countries of origin and returned always just within the two-year limit. They have then stayed a comparatively short time in the UK before going back and repeating the process, always returning just within 2 years. Mr. Pritam Singh is a case in point. Immigration records show that between December 1973 and April 1980 he spent three periods in India, each of them nearly 2 years. Now that is nearly 6 years in a total period of 6 years and 4 months. Would it not be fairer to say, therefore, that Mr. Singh was a resident of India visiting Britain rather than the other way round?

This at any rate is how it appeared to the immigration authorities in both his and a great many other similar cases, and so it was resolved that action would be taken to prevent this abuse of the law, which in effect permitted all manner of people to continue to avail themselves of all the rights of permanent British residence while in no way being permanent residents. Henceforth when a previous resident of this country returned here after a period abroad it would be necessary for the immigration authorities to be persuaded that this was their normal country of residence before they could be

granted indefinite leave to enter.

Mr. Singh, however, was by some unhappy circumstance not aware of this change in the rules when he made his last trip to India, on which he departed on July 1st 1978. When he returned on April 20th 1980, the immigration officers asked him how long he intended to remain in the UK before he went to India again. He said that he would probably be staying here for 5 months. Then, according to Mr. Singh (shock, horror, gasp!), the immigration officer retorted: "You bloody people always come back just inside the 2 years."

Mr. Singh was given leave to enter the UK, limited to 6 months. That, as was pointed out by his MP, "completely changed his status . . . for he would not be entitled to be here after a further 6 months and when he left the United Kingdom it would be final farewell."

In fact it is not likely to be final farewell after all. Mr. Archer apparently took up the case of his constituent with the appropriate Minister of State and the latest tidings that he was able to give the House were that a reprieve for Mr. Singh was now probable. His purpose in bringing the matter to the attention of the House, he made clear, was to put the spotlight on an anomaly in the law from which people like Mr. Singh were liable generally to suffer. Perhaps, he said, speaking to the Minister of State, "he can assure us that the Home Office will never treat people quite so contemptuously again."

CONTEMPTUOUS

The use of the words "treat contemptuously" as Mr. Archer employed them is rather curious, for one would have thought that these are the very words that should apply to Mr. Singh's exploitation of the immigration laws. He knew very well that those laws were designed in order to enable people of immigrant background living in this country to maintain contact with relations or dependants in their countries of origin, not to permit people who spent most of their time living in their countries of origin to come and live in Britain when they like and for as long as they like. Once it was clear that Mr. Singh was utilising the law for a very different purpose to that for which it was intended, it is hardly a matter for surprise or shock that those responsible for enforcing that law should decide to put a stop to his games.

Contd. on next page

This — although in much more muted language — was the gist of the reply given to Mr. Archer by the spokesman in the House for the Minister of State, Mr. Patrick Mayhew, when he tried to explain the reasoning behind the decision of the responsible immigration officer to grant Mr. Singh leave to stay in this country for 6 months only. Mr. Mayhew went on to say that in the light of all the facts now available about Mr. Singh's case should he now apply to return permanently to this country it is likely that his application would be granted.

Precisely what 'facts' Mr. Mayhew had in mind when he made this statement in the Commons is not clear, for he adduced nothing to alter the picture that the case had presented of a man who quite clearly was simply laughing at the slackness and softness of British legal procedure as applied to people of his kind and intent on playing the same games with the immigration authorities in the future as he had done in the past. More likely, the 'facts' that impressed themselves upon the Minister of State were those of the furore that the case had aroused in the immigrant community and in the massed ranks of do-gooders and bleeding hearts in this country and the political *cause celebre* that they were likely to make of it if matters were not settled to their, and Mr. Singh's, satisfaction.

One factor which seems to have reduced Mr. Archer almost to tears was the appalling thought of Mr. Singh being deprived of his normal rights of residence in this country while his wife and family were living here. It did not seem to occur to the Honourable Member for Warley West that if this were the position it would not be greatly different to that which had been existing ever since December 1973, during which time Mr. Singh, by his own free will, had only been together with his wife and family for a total of about 6 months! To most rational-thinking people, a husband and wife who can live on two opposite sides of the world by their own consent for 69 months out of 76 are able to do without each other pretty well, but to take that fact into account would be to deprive this story of the anguish and pathos that are so necessary a part of its impact upon Parliament and the public mind.

Altogether, the time taken for this item in Parliament on the day quoted was half an hour. Not a vast amount of time, perhaps, but when it is considered that that half an hour must be multiplied by the number of members present in the House at the time.

RED CHOICE

*Lord Stansgate, alias Comrade Benn,
A master of baloney,
Had a proletarian yen,
So changed his name to 'Tony'.*

*The Conference vote was taken
In atmosphere quite chilly;
They didn't vote for Tony Benn
But plumped for Silly Billy!*

to obtain a figure of parliamentary man-hours spent upon the case during that one day, and when also it is borne in mind that the item occupied MPs and government ministers in some considerable correspondence outside parliamentary time, we are able to ascertain that altogether a pretty large portion of the resources of state were given to seeing, not only that Mr. Pritam Singh was made happy, but that the apprehension of an indeterminate number of other coloured immigrants was cooled as well.

EXPENSIVE

We pay expensively for the maintenance of the institution of Parliament and its apparatus of government. Perhaps a lot of us, when our next tax returns are made, may wonder how our rulers manage to justify allocating what we pay for to a matter like this in the manner and on the scale shown in this little story. Aren't there bigger matters of national import that call for their attention? If the Commons can sit for half an hour listening to what happened to Mr. Pritam Singh when he met the immigration officer at the airport, no doubt it can spend a similar time listening to what happened to Mr. Winston Elijah Jones when he was stopped by a policeman in Atlantic Road, Brixton, or little Nelson Ogbumwumbo when he aroused teacher's anger in his comprehensive school in Toxteth, Liverpool — the possibilities are endless!

There are of course hundreds of thousands of native Britons who every year suffer some personal injustice, or at least regard themselves as having so suffered, at the hands of officialdom. If their cases were heard in the House of Commons in the same

proportion as are those of the Pritam Singhs of this world, MPs would need to spend a 400-hour week doing nothing else but listen to them, but of course this is avoided either by such cases being ignored and forgotten or, at best, dealt with at the most minor official level. The thing is, you see, that political capital simply is not to be had by the bringing of such matters to the Commons in the way done by Mr. Archer. There are indeed MPs — at least some of them — who represent areas where White Britons actually form a large part of the voting populace, but those White Britons do not have anything like the same highly organised and noisy political lobbies to agitate over their grievances as do the likes of Mr. Singh, so that there are few votes to be won in taking those grievances to the nation's senior debating chamber and riveting the Members of the House with the details of them for half an hour or more.

We live, you see, in the era of mass democracy. This means that every politician, from when he wakes up in the morning till he goes to bed at night — and for a considerable time after that, has to concentrate his mind on the task of winning votes. As an item of the business of the nation, the case of Mr. Pritam Singh may seem piffling in the extreme and the most ridiculous waste of time of the nation's leaders. As a matter of importance, however, in the business of party politics, where the respective parties are jostling with one another to win the favour of the coloured electorate, such a case looms very large indeed. An MP's seat may depend on it, and upon that seat may in turn depend whether his party wins or loses the next General Election. That is what the game of democracy is all about.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—


British Isles: £6.00 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £6.35 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £8.30 ☐
Unsealed air mail Europe & Middle East: £9.10 ☐ Unsealed air mail Canada, USA, South America
and Africa: £10.70 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £11.60 ☐

Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of £1 applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 28p ea.; 20-49 copies: 25p ea.; 50-99 copies: 21p ea.; 100-199 copies: 18p ea.;
200-499 copies: 15p ea.; 500 copies or over: 14p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



SIR: If I might point out a slight error of fact in your article on the aristocracy last month, you bemoan the fact that the Marquis of Bath could produce a son like Patrick Lichfield. Don't worry, he didn't! Patrick Lichfield, or, to give him his full title, Thomas Patrick John Anson, 5th Earl of Lichfield, is a peer of the realm in his own right. He succeeded his grandfather in 1960. As far as I know the Anson family are not related to the Thynne family in any way.

The Marquis of Bath has his own wayward son, whom you may have been thinking of, viz Viscount Weymouth. He is, I think, eccentric rather than decadent, although you probably disagree. He wears his hair plaited with a pony tail, does rather odd murals at Longleat and has his own political party, the Wessex Nationalist Party. He is rather odd but quite different to Lord Lichfield.

J. ROWLEY
Blackpool, Lancs.

(Editor's note: Mr. Rowley is quite right. We apologise to our readers for this error, though it does not make any difference to the sense of the article)

SIR: There have been several references recently in nationalist circles to the futility of seeking 'respectability'. The letter from R. Burton called it an 'obsession' and blamed it for many of the factional splits.

Of course it really all depends on what one means by the term. Being the target of lies and dirty names is an occupational hazard in politics, just as much for leading figures as for nationalists — as we have witnessed recently. Unless, however, the smears are concerned with criminal activities or sexual deviation — and can be made to stick — they are soon forgotten by the general public.

Some nationalists who leave our ranks do so because of the Nazi smears but for the majority who desire 'respectability' for

the nationalist cause the matter goes deeper.

I believe that when most people refer to 'respectability' in a political party they mean a party whose public activities are well conducted and disciplined, whose members do not give the impression of being an unruly rabble, whose local and national leaders have blameless personal lives and do not possess criminal records for offences which the general public regard as unacceptable in those aspiring to public office.

The desire for respectability on these terms cannot be said to be an 'obsession' or 'futile'. In fact it is a priority if a united nationalist party is ever to come about and succeed in its objectives.

P. BAKER
Reading, Berks.

SIR: What is the purpose of the article 'How myth enforces God's battalions' by Ralph Perier? He has a useful historical point to make about the responsibility for the destruction of Guernica, but he wraps this up in a diatribe against Christians that is as vicious and besotted as anything written against nationalists in the magazine Searchlight. I cannot conceive of an article less likely to serve the cause of nationalist unity.

The Christian religion is not an "un-reasoning belief in dogma", nor is it a mere ideology; it is a living faith held by millions of our forebears and by millions alive today. Without this leavening of Christian faith our ancestors from the Roman and post-Roman periods ("that mongrel rabble of a rotting empire" as Mr. Perier so elegantly puts it) would never have created a nation that endured; without the leavening of Christian faith, no amount of fierceness, no amount of shouting, no grim depths of unyielding determination are going to save our nation in the crucial years ahead.

Of course a hostile commentator can find, in the 2,000 years of the Church's history, numerous instances of credulity, cruelty, fraudulence and fanaticism; but to sum up an institution by its faults and failings alone is totally misleading. For example, it is utterly untrue to assert that the average bishop or abbot in the Middle Ages was just a con-man, or that all protestants and catholics in the 17th Century believed each other to be devils incarnate. And what of the author's attempt to equate Christianity with Communism? This is not history, Sir, but mere hysteria!

A. D. WHITING
Whitstable, Kent

SIR: No congrats on the un-Spearhead-like article 'How myth enforces God's battalions' by Ralph Perier, containing about

three columns worth of good information in pages seething with anti-Christian hate. Oddly enough, on the day I received it I saw Triumph of the will, made in 1934, when the lapsed catholic Hitler who then had spurned Christ was in a position of power that patriots nowadays can only dream of and still on the up-and-up, with much to offer his people. Within a few years he had turned triumph into disaster. He has been the laughing stock of the Jewish enemy ever since, and the happy, trusting young Aryans as seen by the thousands in the film were annihilated by the million.

God is not mocked, and NFs, NNFs and NNNFs will founder ingloriously if they try.

Speaking of the Spanish Civil War, Perier says: "Almost all the journalists from the English-speaking countries that were in Spain in 1937 were 'liberals', communists and Jews." Yes, and all the more credit to our Catholic press, who supported the Nationalists, who were of course for God, Church and Nation under the leadership of that gallant Catholic gentleman Francisco Franco. The scum Perier refers to naturally supported the side that spat on the church and were quite ready to use lies, some of which Perier exposes, following their master Satan, the 'Father of lies'. And unlike the lapsed catholic Hitler's 1,000-year Reich, Spaniards at least had the benefits of Franco's victory throughout the rest of his long life.

Things become slightly comic when Perier uses the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as the very acme and model of Christian falsehood. This dogma of course asserts Our Lady's freedom from the stain of Original Sin from her very conception in her mother's womb. The rest of us have to have the stain, inherited from the fallen Adam, removed by Baptism. Now the Immaculate Conception is one dogma Perier certainly believes in — in fact he believes in his own and everyone else's Immaculate Conception too. Of course I'd like him to believe in Adam's sin in Eden and hence the necessity of the sacrament of Baptism, but meanwhile his tiny and uninstructed mind is no sort of threat to my belief in all the dogmas of Holy Church, including of course the virgin birth of Our Lord.

A. J. PURNELL
London E. 11

(Editor's note: It is once again necessary to point out to our readers that Spearhead publishes articles that we believe make interesting points, including those written from a pro-Christian as well as a non-Christian point of view. This does not mean that we endorse everything contained in those articles. I would just say one thing in answer to Mr. Purnell: I know something about Ralph Perier and can assure Mr. Purnell that his mind is neither tiny nor uninstructed.

When respectability failed

AMERICA'S DECLINE: THE EDUCATION OF A CONSERVATIVE by Revilo P. Oliver (Londinium Press, 21 Kensington Park Road, London. W.11). Paper back. £3.75 (inc. post)

GALLING though it is to one's British pride, one has to admit that most of the really outstanding intellects and thinkers on the radical right of politics within the Anglo-Saxon world in recent times have been Americans. Added to Wilmot Robertson and W. G. Simpson, on whose writings we have commented in *Spearhead*, is Revilo Pendleton Oliver, Professor of Classics at the University of Illinois, from whom we have more than once been very pleased to publish articles and with whom I have had the pleasure of some extremely stimulating correspondence. It was therefore certain that I would welcome the appearance of a book expanding on many of Professor Oliver's ideas and describing in detail his political development over the 3½ decades following World War II.

Such a book has now appeared and is entitled *America's decline: the education of a conservative*. Besides living up to the second part of its title in outlining Professor Oliver's graduation from the 'respectable' politics of the John Birch Society to a position of radical racial nationalism, the book features reprints of many of his most noteworthy articles between 1955 and 1966, when he was a prolific writer for numerous publications, and which range from a discussion of the merits of Caesar and Cicero to a devastating critique of the philosophy of history of Professor Arnold Toynbee, the paid propagandist of Chatham House.

OPTIMISM

Appropriately, the book opens with the reminiscence of a train journey Westward across America in 1945, in which the author recalls his mood at the time. It was a mood of anger but overlaid with optimism. Professor Oliver had become aware of a criminal conspiracy penetrating the highest echelons of the US Government and designed to promote the interests of the Soviet Union. He recognised that America's recently deceased President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had been an integral part of that conspiracy and on its behalf had contrived to manoeuvre his country into war with Germany and Japan. The city of Washington, which the

professor had just left behind, is described here as the District of Corruption, but as the speed of the train rapidly increased the distance from DC his wife noticed the improvement in his mood. After all, they were journeying into the American hinterland, where that corruption had not so far penetrated, and as they did so optimism once more took over.

This optimism lay in the belief, perhaps easy to sustain at that time, that corruption in high places would duly be exposed and that with this exposure the patriotic wrath of the American people would prevail to the point of cleansing the body politic of the country of the impure elements that had infiltrated it. It was still the age of boundless confidence in the future of the United States, in the soundness of its institutions and the spirit and good sense of its people. The US had just emerged from the war as the greatest power in the world. Her frontiers were still expanding. The energy and dynamism of her society were considerable. Few suspected that she was in need of any fundamental political change, and it was with this thought that Professor Oliver looked forward to the prospect of being able to concentrate on his academic career, confident in the view that there were ample numbers of public men who would in due course correct the wrongs that he had perceived in the circles of the nation's government.

Ten years later this optimism had largely evaporated. By 1955, says the author: "I had to re-examine the available data and reconsider the plight and potentialities of the American people, who had signally failed to do what I had once been certain they would naturally and instinctively do." In this realisation there dawned the thought that political action might be called for, but what kind of political action? Not yet a kind based on the acceptance that America's 'democratic' institutions and way of life had become inwardly rotten and diseased, but rather a kind inspired by the wish to protect these institutions and way of life from those alien bodies that seemed to threaten them. "In 1955," the author says, "... I saw no clear evidence of the subconscious death-wish, the degenerate yearning for annihilation as a Nirvana ... that Whittaker Chambers had identified as the lethal soul-sickness of a self-doomed civilisation."

Thus began Professor Oliver's path towards involvement in the conservative movement in America — a movement which, it should be stressed, is of a somewhat more politically enlightened pedigree than the party bearing the same name in Britain, but which nevertheless is similarly dedicated to the defence of the old order of society

rather than the construction of a new. Two years later the professor was writing and speaking regularly for conservative and patriotic organisations and in 1958 participated in the foundation of the John Birch Society.

By this time his political sentiments had developed to a stage several degrees more extreme than those embraced by the Birchers, and included a thorough understanding of the international Jewish question. He nevertheless was willing to endorse the basic strategy of the Birchers, which eschewed any mention of this and other sensitive questions and which contrived, by means of a sober and 'respectable' approach, to win influence among the key sections of the American middle class. In this approach, to condemn 'Communism' was quite permissible and indeed to be encouraged. 'Liberalism' might also be attacked, provided the emphasis was on the modern 'trendy lefty' variety. What was taboo was the expression of any honest convictions on race, and in particular on 'God's Chosen Race'. This did not, mind you, preclude people "forming their own conclusions" about the racial undertones of the 'Communist Conspiracy'; the important thing, as the author points out, was that these conclusions should not be publicly expressed! At all costs, the reputation of the Society for 'respectability' and 'moderation' had to be preserved.

BIRCHER'S DEMISE

Professor Oliver traces the career of the John Birch Society through to its eventual demise as a serious factor in American politics. This demise, as he makes clear, was rooted in the fact that from the very beginning the Society was controlled from the background by people representing the very same forces of corruption and treason that its purpose, ostensibly, was to oppose. The man running it, in whom he had originally placed his confidence as 'leader', turned out to be nothing more than a particularly expert salesman — a vocation in which he had previously made a considerable fortune for himself in the candy business. When the chips were down, the fellow proved to be the most lamentable weakling — a fact that was probably shrewdly perceived by his subterranean backers when they set him up in the first place. After soaking American patriots of a vast amount of money, the Society never achieved any of the aims for which it claimed to have been founded but

Contd. on page 20

West London NNF

A WEST LONDON group of the New National Front was formed last month at a meeting in Brentford addressed by party Leader John Tyndall. West London was up till this meeting one of the party's weakest areas and one of the only ones where no active group existed. The meeting was attended by 35 people and a good proportion expressed their support.

The Organiser of the group is Martin Braithwaite.

WIN A T.V. SET!

Greenwich Branch of the New National Front will be holding a Christmas raffle on Wednesday, December 9th. There are only 100 tickets, which have been especially printed for this raffle.

The winner's prize is a brand new, fully guaranteed 12-inch B plus W mains portable TV set. This set is ideal for use as a second TV in the home. It has excellent reception and a conversion lead for 12 volt car use and an earplug supplied for private listening.

Tickets for the raffle are £1 each and can be obtained from Greenwich Branch Organiser Terry Fitzgerald, 3 Collyer House, Hurst Place Estate, Woolwich Road, London SE2 0AJ.

Glasgow NNF active nationwide

Glasgow NNF sell *New Frontier* outside Rangers football ground (left) and in London's Brick Lane (right)



GLASGOW New National Front has in recent weeks emerged as one of the party's most active branches — and not just in Glasgow itself. The branch has set a fine example to others in the extent to which its members have travelled around the country to attend national activities.

The branch is ably led by Mr. Bill Skinner, a Londoner who moved to Scotland when he married his wife Isobel, a Glasgow girl who stands staunchly by him in everything he does in the party. Isobel Skinner was the NF parliamentary candidate for Glasgow (Govan) in the General Election of

1979 and also took part in the party's General Election TV broadcast.

Six Glasgow members recently attended a London rally and travelled to the capital at their own expense for the purpose, sleeping on a member's floor then partaking in a paper sale at Brick Lane before returning home.

As a measure of the importance the NNF gives to its development in Scotland, National Organiser Charles Parker has made three trips to visit the Glasgow branch in recent months and has done much to stimulate the party's growth in the area.

From: STEVEN BOOKS, P.O. Box 112, London N22 6AW (all prices include postage)

JEWS AND THEIR LIES, THE by Martin Luther (£1.60)

A popular book by the reformer of the Christian Church.

JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW (Back copy £1.60; current copy £2.20)

Articles by historians on modern politics and history from a revisionist viewpoint.

LET MY PEOPLE GO (60p)

A well illustrated magazine-style book which examines in depth the extent of Jewish control in Britain.

LETTER TO THE POPE ON HIS VISIT TO AUSCHWITZ by Leon Degrelle (50p)

The author was the leader of the pre-war Rexist movement in Belgium and a veteran of the Russian front.

LIFTING THE LID OFF THE ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE (40p)

Exposing the Communists and Jews who control ANAL.

MEIN KAMPF by Adolf Hitler (£5.00)

This edition is the only English version approved by the author

MURDER OF LAWRENCE OF ARABIA by Mathew Eden (£7.20)

A novel which advances the theory of how Lawrence was

killed by the Secret Service.

NEW UNHAPPY LORDS, THE by A.K. Chesterton (£2.75)

One of the really great books of the post-war nationalist scene. A.K. Chesterton was the first leader of the National Front. Hard-back edition.

OUT OF STEP by Arnold Leese, MRCVS (£2.50)

Events in the life of an anti-Jewish camel doctor. An autobiography that is a pleasure to read. Much sought after by Leese admirers.

NUREMBERG AND OTHER WAR CRIMES TRIALS by Richard Harwood (£1.00)

Exposes the terrible injustices perpetrated during the trials, including torture, and contains evidence of the injustice of this 'kangaroo court'.

PROGRAMME OF THE N. S. D. A. P. (£1.00)

English translation of the original

PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION translated by Victor Marsden (£2.00)

A world-famous report of a secret meeting at which a blueprint was made to control the world.

PLYMOUTH NEW NATIONAL FRONT held another highly successful rally on October 17th. With weather conditions much less favourable than for the early July rally, a smaller attendance was expected. Nevertheless, a total of about 300 turned out.

On the orders of Mr. John Alderson, police chief for Devon and Cornwall, a last-minute alteration was made to the assembly point, which made it impossible for many participants to be informed in time. The result was that the rally took place in two parts, with neither being able to link up with the other.

The rally was attended by NNF Leader John Tyndall.

Read **NEW FRONTIER** Voice of the New National Front

You can obtain single copies of *New Frontier* by paying a subscription of £3.25 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £3.75 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *New Frontier* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:—

10 copies	£1.20	+	30p	post
25 copies	£2.70	+	87p	post
50 copies	£4.80	+	£1.43	post
100 copies	£8.40	+	£1.73	post
150 copies	£11.70	+	£1.90	post
200 copies	£14.40	+	£2.05	post
300 copies	£19.80	+	£2.35	post
400 copies	£24.00	+	£2.55	post
500 copies	£29.40)	Bulk rates	
1,000 copies	£55.20)	by roadline	

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB. Please keep orders and enquiries for *New Frontier* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

Tyndall on tape

NNF Recordings have produced the first of a series of tapes dealing with topics of interest to nationalists. On this tape are two recorded talks by John Tyndall, each lasting 45 minutes. The talks are:—

- (1) **OUR ANGLO-SAXON HERITAGE.** In this talk Tyndall speaks of the world-wide dispersion of the British peoples and their present lack of unity in the face of a common threat to their survival. He stipulates what the Anglo-Saxons must do to recover their once pre-eminent position.
- (2) **BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC CRISIS:** In this talk Tyndall attacks the policies that have made 2 million unemployed and outlines the nationalist solution put forward by the New National Front.

This tape, entitled Tyndall Speaks, is available from NNF Recordings, Box 115, Hove, Sussex BN3 3SB. Price: £3.00 (plus 15p for postage).

300 on march in Plymouth



NNF march column proceeds through Plymouth

SPEARHEAD FUND

Spearhead, in this difficult period for British Nationalism, has only been kept alive by the loyalty of its most steadfast readers and by the generosity of particular supporters who have made sacrifices from out of their own pockets to help us continue in print.

Many former readers have felt unable to renew their subscriptions because of unemployment and the consequent need for financial economies. We have also had to sustain considerable losses in bulk sales as a result of the present division among British Nationalist groups.

These factors have made us all the more dependent upon the donations we can obtain from our small circle of committed loyalists. We can only ask that those in this circle maintain their contributions in the coming months and that others who have not previously donated beyond paying the bare price of their copies now try to do so. This is essential if we are to continue in publication.

We remind all those making financial donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to save the time of our office staff and economise on postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation that their donation has been received, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with the donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead*, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

THE TRAIL THAT LEADS BACK TO PAWSONS ROAD

(Contd. from page 13)

costs. As with the one pursued by Mrs. Thatcher's Government, it is a road that they must see through to the bitter end — as if their very existence has come to depend upon it.

Rather than go back on that course, they will, it now appears, make any deal and enter into any association with anyone, including persons who by all past criteria and record are sheer poison to the party and to the cause of nationalism. It has come to our notice that in recent months a number of people have been accepted back into the party fold who played key roles in the subversion of 1975. Now the man who played undoubtedly the most subversive and sinister role of all has become *persona grata* again — at least to the point of being accepted as landlord of the party's HQ premises.

Why? We repeat that question again: Why? For it is a question that is pregnant with meaning. Those who are able to supply the answer to it might well supply the answer to many other questions related to it in a train of perplexing events that have marked the party's history over the past two years or so.

In January 1980 the NF Directorate was confronted with the choice of holding onto the 'poofs' parlour' within the party whose activities had resulted in the defection of hundreds of members — or retaining the leadership under which the party had enjoyed its periods of greatest growth and success. It opted to keep the poofs' parlour.

In May of the same year the man whom the Directorate had elected to succeed the outgoing Chairman was approached by the latter with a proposal that the two have a meeting and frank discussion on how to avert a dangerous split in the party. He contemptuously rejected the proposal — with the result that the split took place and endures to this day.

In the past year the party has mounted a number of public demonstrations, and has allowed literature to be published and distributed in its name, which would seem to many previous well-wishers to be almost calculated to portray it in the most squalid and scruffy light possible and to lend an undesired credence to the propaganda of its enemies.

Now it enters into an agreement to use as party Headquarters a building belonging to one who on his past record should surely be kept at bargepole length by the party for all time.

To an increasing number of nationalists, this sequence of events is absolutely incomprehensible except as part of a determined will towards the party's self-destruction.

The question that we asked in a preceding paragraph must then be seen as part of a larger and more fundamental question: **Who is currently running the National Front and to what purpose?**

Perhaps none of these questions will ever be conclusively answered. All we can

say with certainty is that in those circles where in the middle to late 1970s there was alarm and horror at the rise of the NF in this country there must now be a mood of uninhibited glee and satisfaction.

TROUBLE ON THE BUSES

(Contd. from page 5)

be considered.

Oxford has set an interesting example, by the establishment of large peripheral car parks with regular shuttle bus services into the centre of town. This scheme has helped to reduce congestion and has proved generally a big success.

Whilst Britain's bus services may not be one of the more important issues of today, the whole sorry state of affairs is perhaps symptomatic of the problems a Nationalist Government would have to face. The Capitalism-versus-Socialism conflict has created much confusion, and a lot of work is required to turn this chaos into some semblance of order.

WHEN RESPECTABILITY FAILED

(Contd. from page 17)

merely provided a safety valve for the growing right-wing sentiment in America whereby that sentiment could be diverted away from channels in which it might pose a danger to those who wielded the real power. By 1966 Professor Oliver had had enough of this, and he got out.

His experience in the Birch Society convinced him of the worthlessness, not only of that society, but of conservatism generally. In no place in the book is this better described than in the section where he relates the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, the former communist who turned against communism and who died full of the deepest pessimism for the future of the west:—

"Chambers also saw the fatal weakness of much contemporary conservatism . . . The parlour pink could destroy, but the parlour blue cannot build. The conservatism of *bons mots*, witty repartee, ingenious syllogisms, fashionable literary reminiscences, and a

parvenu's anxious striving for 'moderation' and decorum among the teacups — that conservatism is too anaemic ever to emerge from the parlour into the open air of an inclement world . . ."

The conclusion of the author is that America, and by implication the whole of the West, have far passed the point at which they could be saved by the preservation or restoration of traditional institutions. "Such nostalgic aspirations for the past," he says:—

" . . . are mere romanticism. They are dangerously antiquarian illusions today, when the only really fundamental question is whether our race still has the will-to-live or is so biologically degenerate that it will choose extinction."

I leave the final words on Professor Oliver's book to the writer of the introduction to it, Sam Dickson, with whom I spent many enjoyable hours of conversation when I was his guest in Decatur, Georgia, 2½ years ago:—

"No matter how dismal the verdict of the twentieth century to date on the racial nationalist cause, so long as our race can generate such sons as Dr. Oliver the situation is not hopeless."

Find out about the New National Front

Send 20p for information pack.

To:
P.O. BOX 115
HOVE
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

I enclose.....